REMARKS

In the Office Action[1] dated December 16, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,665,020 to Stahl et al. ("*Stahl*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,918,123 to Shteyn ("*Shteyn*"). Claims 10 and 12 remain pending and under current examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The prior art cited by the Examiner, *Stahl* in view of *Shteyn*, does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 10 and 12. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 10 recites a combination including, for example:

> a first controlling apparatus connected to a predetermined network, said first controlling apparatus including a first control section for preparing and transmitting a request to another controlling apparatus to execute a connection management function when the first controlling apparatus does not mount a control module of said connection management function and has been notified by said another controlling apparatus that said another controlling apparatus mounts a control module of said connection management function.

(emphasis added). The Examiner states that the DTV of *Stahl* teaches the claimed first controlling apparatus and the IRM 26 of *Stahl* teaches the claimed first control section (Office Action at page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree. The IRM 26 is located within the serial bus protocol for the IEEE 1394 serial bus 16 (column 3, lines 55-65 and Figure 3). The IRM 26 "exercises a subset of the management responsibilities normally assumed by the bus manager 28" (col. 3, lines 54-65). The

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

IRM 26 is not included in the DTV. Therefore, *Stahl* does not teach "a first controlling apparatus connected to a predetermined network, said first controlling apparatus including a first control section," as recited in claim 10.

Further, even assuming that the "IRM 26 allocates and deallocates the channels and bandwidth in order to establish the connection" (Office Action at page 3), there is no teaching that "the first controlling apparatus does not mount a control module ... [and] said another controlling apparatus mounts a control module", as recited in claim 10.

In *Stahl*, the first controlling apparatus (DTV) receives an RCA command from an RCA remote controller 13 and will translate that to the universal format and transfer across the serial bus 16 (col. 8, lines 15-20). The Sony DVCR 12 (another controlling apparatus) will receive the universal command and perhaps translate it into the Sony format and take action (col. 8, lines 20-22). Therefore, both controlling apparatuses must mount a control module because data transmission between the two can only occur if each apparatus is controlling the output flow from one apparatus, through the serial bus 16, to the other apparatus. Moreover, the two apparatuses are controlled by the commands and data flow from the other, and a control module must be mounted so that each apparatus is controlled.

The Examiner cites col. 6, lines 8-20 of *Stahl*. However, that passage discloses:

> The flow of isochronous data is controlled by one output plug control register (oPCR) and one output master plug register (oMPR) located on the transmitting side ...
>
> The reception of an isochronous data flow through an input plug is controlled by one input plug control register (iPCR) and one input master plug register (iMPR) located in the receiving device. (col. 6, lines 8-17)

Controlling the flow and reception of isochronous data does not suggest a first controlling apparatus that "does not mount a control module of said connection management function and has been notified by said another controlling apparatus that said another controlling apparatus mounts a control module of said connection management function."

The Examiner further states that *Stahl* does not teach the claimed "request which utilizes a self describing data structure which provides device control data, the device control data including an override DCM of the transmitting device and the receiving device" (Office Action at page 4), and the Examiner relies on *Shteyn*. Even assuming that *Shteyn* teaches a self describing data structure and override DCM, *Shteyn* does not cure the deficiencies of *Stahl*. *Shteyn* does not teach "the first controlling apparatus does not mount a control module ... [and] said another controlling apparatus mounts a control module," as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, *Stahl* and *Shteyn* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 10. Independent claim 12, though of different scope from claim 10, recites limitations similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 10. Claim 12 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 16, 2006

By: _____
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921